

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.19850 of 2011

=====

Megh Nath Prasad son of Late Babu Ram, Resident Of Village - Tetrawan, P.S. -
Manpur, District - Nalanda

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar Through The Principal Secretary, Department Of Rural Development , Government Of Bihar, Patna
2. The District Magistrate, Nalanda At Biharsharif
3. The Deputy Development Commissioner, Nalanda At Biharsharif
4. The Sub Divisional Officer, Biharsharif, District Nalanda
5. The Block Development Officer, Biharsharif, District - Nalanda
6. The District Supply Officer, Biharsharif, District - Nalanda
7. The District Manager, Bihar State Food & Civil Supply Corporation Ltd., Mogal Kuan, Biharsharif, District - Nalanda

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Vibhuti Ranjan Sonvadra, Advocate.

For the Respondents : Mr. S.D. Yadav, AAG-IX

Mr. Nagindra Kumar, AC to AAG-IX

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 26-10-2018

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the respondents.

2. The present writ petition has been filed for the following reliefs –

“(i) For quashing the notice/order dated 25.06.2011 contained in Notice No. 60 dated 25.06.2011 issued under the signature of the Block Development Officer, Biharsharif, Nalanda (respondent no. 5) by which the respondent no. 5 has requested the petitioner to pay/deposit more amount at new rate of 13.70 per kilo instead of Rs. 6.24 fixed earlier and intimated/intimidated to lodge F.I.R. and certificate case, if the petitioner fails to comply the same.

(ii) For directing the respondents to pay the charges of



freight, storage, godown etc. with reasonable interest.

(iii) For any other relief/reliefs for which the petitioner appears to be entitled in the eye of law.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the Enquiry Commission headed by Hon'ble Mr. Justice Udai Sinha (Retired) has now submitted its report and any further action in relation to recovery of the value of undistributed rice under the SGRY Scheme would abide by the decision of the State Government to be taken on the basis of such report.

4. In the above view of the matter, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks permission to withdraw the present writ petition with liberty to approach this Court afresh as and when the occasion arises in future.

5. Having regard to the stand of the petitioner, the writ petition stands disposed of with the aforesaid liberty.

6. Let the authorities refrain from taking coercive measures against the petitioner until decision is taken by the State Government, as aforesaid.

(Vikash Jain, J)

Md. Ibrarul/BT

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N.A.
Uploading Date	30.10.2018
Transmission Date	N.A.

